

CONTINENTAL HEAT TREATING, INC.  
May 8, 1996  
Page 1

LOS ANGELES COUNTY FIRE DEPT/HHMD/SMU

CASE SYNOPSIS UPDATE

Date:	JANUARY 4, 1996	Log Number:	951668-377
		Project Mgr:	G Baker
		SMU Priority:	III
		HW Generator:	Yes
		Generator #:	606073-101

Project: CONTINENTAL HEAT TREATING

Address: 10643 S. Norwalk Blvd, Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670

Contaminants: tetrachloroethylene and trichloroethylene

Depth to Ground Water: 35 - 65'      GW contamination: unknown

Responsible Party: Continental Heat Treating  
10643 S. Norwalk Blvd,  
Santa Fe Springs, CA 90670  
Phone #: (310)944-8808  
Contact: James Stull

Consultant: Green Environmental, Inc.  
6727 Greenleaf Ave,  
Whittier, CA 90601  
Phone #: (310)698-5338  
Contact: Kent Green

Case Update:

One hand auger boring was advanced February 6, 1995, to a maximum of 10' bgs. Samples were taken at 1', 5', and 10' with analysis by EPA Method 8240.

Maximum PCE was 7514  $\mu\text{g/Kg}$  ( $> 100 \times$  RWQCB guideline value), with 2/3  $> 1000 \mu\text{g/Kg}$  and the 3rd sample of 290  $\mu\text{g/Kg}$ . Using an AF = 10 [sandy silty soils] with GW at  $\approx 60'$ , the RWQCB guideline for PCE = 50  $\mu\text{g/Kg}$ . All three samples are significantly above the guideline.

Maximum TCE was 4759  $\mu\text{g/Kg}$  ( $\approx 100 \times$  RWQCB guideline value), with the other samples positive but not exceeding the RWQCB guideline amount.

Page 2

At present, the public health (GW) risk is low and the immediate vicinity is under a regional GW cleanup.

I have encouraged the RP to characterize more completely to defend against litigation from the adjacent land owners and the distribution of the cost of the Regional GW cleanup.

**Case Description:**

On November 3, 1993, a complaint from the site operator of adjacent property to the north (lessee: Mobil Exploration) was received by this Department. The complaint alleged Continental Heat Treating was responsible for all or part of the chlorinated VOC contamination on Mobil's oil production lease property at 10607 S. Norwalk Blvd. The complaint was referred to Enforcement Unit for action on November 4, 1993. No enforcement activity by September 27, 1994, prompted a routine complaint inspection October 6, 1994.

Long-time employees all denied any improper disposal, leaking or spillage of vapor degreasing solvents anywhere on the property. Furthermore, the vapor degreaser had been moved from its original location in the shop. Eventually the old location of the degreaser was established. It appeared that this old location was close enough to the northern property line that leaks, sloppy

[REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]

**CONTINENTAL HEAT TREATING****December 13, 1995****Page 2**

operations or spills could have migrated offsite despite employees' statements to the contrary. This inspection resulted in NOV #P14042, which included an order to provide a plan for corrective action at the old vapor degreaser location.

A single boring to a depth of 10' immediately adjacent but exterior to the concrete sump of the old industrial vapor degreaser was proposed. Three soil samples were taken as part of a preliminary assessment. The results of these samples are summarized as follows:

**PCE AND TCE SOIL CONTAMINATION IN  $\mu\text{g/Kg}$**

BORING #	DEPTH (FT)	TRICHLORO-ETHYLENE (TCE)	TETRACHLORO-ETHYLENE (PCE)
B-1	6"	4759 <sup>3</sup>	7514 <sup>3</sup>
B-1	5'	21	290 <sup>3</sup>
B-1	10'	66 <sup>3</sup>	1855 <sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> exceeds 10XMCL; the Los Angeles RWQCB risk-based cleanup standards for TCE and PCE (both of which are  $5\mu\text{g/Kg}$ ) based on the VOC cleanup model.

The maximum TCE and PCE concentrations were 4759 and 7514  $\mu\text{g/Kg}$  respectively and the means were 1615 and 3220  $\mu\text{g/Kg}$  respectively.

No sample exceeded the HBSSL levels as carcinogens (PCE=8,500 and TCE=4,000  $\mu\text{g/Kg}$ ).

The Region IX USEPA residual PRG levels of PCE and TCE allowed (PCE(ind) = 25mg/Kg and PCE(res) = 7mg/Kg; TCE(ind) = 17mg/Kg and TCE(res) = 7.1mg/Kg) in industrial and residential soils were exceeded by PCE in the 6" sample only.

Applying the recent RWQCB model allowing the average attenuation factor of 255XMCL, three of the analyses would exceed the 1.275mg/Kg guideline concentration; PCE at 6" and 10', and TCE at 6".

The results of the preliminary assessment were sufficient documentation of a significant release to require a remedial investigation of the area. A letter was sent to Mr. Stull July 5, 1995, which directed him to determine the extent of the contamination and submit a site mitigation workplan. The workplan was prepared by Green Environmental and starts with a very limited scope investigation of the old vapor degreaser area.

**Issues:**

1. How much of the property needs to be evaluated in the RI?
2. Is it prudent to require a GW monitoring well at this juncture?
3. How much of the information (which the 10607 Norwalk B1 cleanup project has developed) could help economize this project?
4. Is it likely that the proposed borings and sampling protocol will define the vertical and lateral extent of the identified contamination?

**Proposed Soil Sampling Work Plan:**

A work plan for the subsurface site investigation of the immediate area of the old vapor degreaser sump was received October 11, 1995.

A review of the submittal was completed and the following are missing or substantially defective for a complete property investigation. However, the workplan is directed only at the specified area in the immediate vicinity of the old vapor degreaser location.

- 1) A review of the historical use and existing information on the nature of the site mitigation problem.
- 2) Justification for the use of EPA method 8010 for sample analysis.
- 3) Justification for depth and array of borings and sampling.
- 4) Evaluation of public health and environmental concerns.
- 5) Investigation of hydrology and land use.
- 6) Justification for not boring to groundwater for the purpose of sampling for the known VOC contaminants.
- 7) A health and safety plan for the proposed investigation.
- 8) Justification for not submitting a work plan for at least one groundwater monitoring well, per RWQCB specifications, considering the underlying lithology of the site.

**PROPOSED SOIL GAS SURVEY WORKPLAN:**

A workplan for a soil gas survey was submitted November 30, 1995, by EST. The plan follows the requirements and guidelines

CONTINENTAL HEAT TREATING  
December 13, 1995  
Page 4

established by the State WQCB. The proposed array of sample points is the only issue which requires discussion and justification. Considering the involvement with the nextdoor neighbor, more sampling near the north edge of the property seems appropriate.